

April 7, 1993

LA 110

Chamber. Those people do not have to put one of these idiotic votes on the board. They don't have to vote against a woman being given treatment when she is facing an obvious medical emergency. We got the amendment, but we've also got the names and the votes of those who voted against it. And some of those who voted against treating this woman who needs it are going to do all that preaching about the rights of a fetus. The woman in being cannot even be given medical care that she is entitled to, based on how they feel. And my dear friend, Senator LaVon Crosby, who knows that a major bodily function could be the capacity to bear children and the capacity to bear children could be jeopardized by not being given an immediate abortion without delay. But because you don't know whether that condition is irreversible, my dear friend, Senator Crosby, said that should not be an emergency situation, that is not of sufficient seriousness to justify this woman in having the abortion, and that truly disturbs me. What some people on this floor will do has no impact on me whatsoever. They postured when they ran for office, they posture on the floor so it's just a matter of posturing and what they say means nothing whatsoever. But what some people on this floor will say and be forced to do does trouble me. And the reason I say I know they are forced to do it, because they behave at a much higher level than that when the strings are not being pulled from outside this Chamber. I dare say that some people would want to require a woman to be in more dire straits than they would require an animal before the animal could get immediate attention, which indicates if you think syllogistically, like they teach us at Creighton at a school which revels in Thomistic philosophy presided over by the Jesuits, the conclusion of that syllogistic process would be the animal, therefore, has more value than the woman, and their votes demonstrate that. They can never erase those votes. This amendment that I'm offering, if adopted, will not harm what they say their intent is with this bill. This information here cannot even qualify as information because you're acknowledging in the beginning that the doctor may not even know and what could more clearly show the lack of good motive by the people pushing this bill? You're going to require a doctor to give information which you admit yourself the doctor may not have. We haven't even gotten down to the overkill that inheres in the type of medical or biological information, I should say zoological, because we're not talking about plants, the kind of information that must be given, but I bet if we were talking about plants, we could get more consideration for plants than we could get for women. I have seen people treat plants